

Interview Summary

Application No.
10/042,236

Applicant(s)
Halow et al

Examiner
Alexander Kalinowski

Art Unit
3626

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Alexander Kalinowski

(3) _____

(2) Mitchell Wasson

(4) _____

Date of Interview May 28, 2003

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1-23

Identification of prior art discussed:

Little, Pat. No. 5,359,509, Pendleton, Jr. Pat. no. 6,253,186

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:


Applicant's representative discussed claims 1 and 13 with respect to the Little reference. Applicant's Representative pointed out that the key feature of the invention is the ability of the system to determine the appropriateness of a situation where a single practitioner submits more than one disparate medical claim during a single "treatment block" of time. Applicant's representative indicated that an amendment would be forthcoming more clearly claiming this feature. Furthermore, Applicant noted that the Pendleton reference did not disclose the feature of claim 4 of directed to the number of claim hours submitted by a practitioner for a particular period of time. Lastly, Applicant's representative noted the Examiner's use of official notice for claims 22 and 23 and would submit arguments to these claims. The Examiner reserves the right to conduct a new search for prior art upon submission of a formal amendment by Applicant.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required